

SK



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/601,810    08/03/00    COLVER

R    1518.005

PETER L BERGER  
LEVISOHN LERNER BERGER & LANGSAM  
SUITE 2400  
757 THIRD AVENUE  
NEW YORK NY 10017

PM82/0103

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, C	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

3635  
DATE MAILED:

01/03/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/601,810

Applicant(s)

COLVER, ROBERT JOHN

Examiner

Chi Q Nguyen

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 10, 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 5-9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

### Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Priority***

1. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) as follows: The headings are missing. Corrections are required.

***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 3, 5-9 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claims. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 3, 5-9 not been further treated on the merits.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the runners 6 are furring runners of top hat section". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 2, 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hilpert.

Art Unit: 3635

With regards to an independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2, 4 Hilpert discloses a building construction comprising a tree unit 10, end unit beam members 11, beam members 12, transverse C-shaped beams 39, intermediate beams 40, boundary beams 22. (See Figs. 1, 2, 10, Column 3, Lines 83-115, Column 4, Line 129, Column 5, Lines 2-10).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hilpert.

With regards to the method claims 10-11, Hilpert briefly teaches the method of assembly the tree unit by welding, riveting, or other appropriate shop fabricating means (See Column 2, Lines 86-92).

Hilpert does not disclose expressly and specifically as teaches by applicant's invention in claims 10-11. However, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the detailed steps of assembly for installers' benefit at the job construction site.

Art Unit: 3635

*Conclusion*

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Chi Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 605-1224, Monday-Thursday (7:00-5:00), Fridays off or the examiner's supervisor Carl D. Friedman (703) 308-0839.

CN

12/27/00



Carl D. Friedman  
**Supervisory Patent Examiner**  
Group 3600